REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 6, 19 through 21 and 26 through 30 remain in this application.

Claims 1 through 6, 19 through 21 and 26 through 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0194388 to Boloker, et al. ("Boloker, et al. publication").

Independent claim 1 provides a controller; and at least one multi-modal session proxy server having a proxy address, wherein the controller determines, on a per session basis, a multi-modal proxy identifier representing the proxy address of the multi-modal session proxy server. Thus, a proxy identifier representing a proxy address of a proxy server is determined on a per session basis. The multi-modal session proxy server is one of a plurality of multi-modal session proxies within a network element (FIG 1, network element 102, and page 10, lines 14 through 16), so the present invention uses a proxy identifier representing a proxy address on a per session basis to overcome the problems associated with a static multi-modal proxy address (page 5, lines 17 through 22).

In contrast, the Boloker, et al. publication does not describe or suggest a proxy identifier representing a proxy address of a proxy server that is determined on a per session basis. The Boloker, et al. publication describes, particularly in FIG. 24 and at paragraph [0396] a distributed multi-modal framework that includes a server 212 that includes a multi-modal shell 41 and, in some embodiments, the multi-modal shell functions as a virtual proxy (see paragraph [0202]). Although the operation of the virtual proxy is not described, a proxy server may have a proxy

Page 2 of 5

address. However, the Boloker, et al. publication does not describe or suggest any type of proxy

identifier representing a proxy address of a proxy server, let alone determining this type of proxy

identifier on a per session basis, as required by claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 distinguishes

patentably from the Boloker, et al. publication.

Claims 2 through 6 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 1.

Therefore, claims 2 through 6 distinguish patentably from the Boloker, et al. publication for the

reasons stated above for independent claim 1.

Independent claim 19 provides receiving a multi-modal proxy identifier, on a per session

basis, for a browser; evaluating, on a per session basis, a browser proxy identifier in response to

receiving the multi-modal proxy identifier; and sending an information request via a multi-modal

session proxy server identified by the multi-modal proxy identifier. Thus, a browser proxy

identifier is evaluated in response to receiving a multi-modal proxy identifier that identifies a

multi-modal session proxy server on a per session basis. The Boloker, et al. publication does not

describe or suggest any type of multi-modal proxy identifier that identifies a proxy server nor

evaluating a browser proxy identifier in response to receiving a multimodal proxy identifier, let

alone evaluating these two proxy identifiers on a per session basis, as required by claim 19.

Therefore, claim 19 distinguishes patentably from the Boloker, et al. publication.

Claims 20 and 21 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 1.

Therefore, claims 20 and 21 distinguish patentably from the Boloker, et al. publication for the

reasons stated above for independent claim 19.

Serial No. 10/034,794   Attorney Docket No. 33692.01.0023

Independent claim 26 provides determining a multi-modal session proxy server, on a per session basis; and providing, on a per session basis, a multi-modal proxy identifier to a browser. The Boloker, et al. publication does not describe or suggest determining a proxy server and providing a proxy identifier to a browser, let alone performing these two steps on a per session basis, as required by claim 26. Therefore, claim 26 distinguishes patentably from the Boloker, et al. publication.

Claims 27 through 30 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 26. Therefore, claims 27 through 30 distinguish patentably from the Boloker, et al. publication for the reasons stated above for independent claim 26.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 1 through 6, 19 through 21 and 26 through 30 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Page 4 of 5

Serial No. 10/034,794   Attorney Docket No. 33692.01.0023

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the

specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests

that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any

questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is

encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

                                        Respectfully submitted,
                                        Balasuriya, Senaka

                                        _____ 03/30/06
Please forward all correspondence to: Hisashi D. Watanabe   Date
Motorola, Inc.   Attorney for Applicant(s)
Law Department (HDW)   Registration No. 37,465
600 North US Highway 45, AS437   Telephone: (847) 523-2322
Libertyville, IL 60048   Facsimile: (847) 523-2350

Page 5 of 5